

Applic. No. 10/799,099
Amdt. dated March 30, 2007
Reply to Office action of February 27, 2007

Drawing Amendments

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1.
This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet
including Fig. 1. Fig. 1 has been designated as "Prior Art".

Please approve the drawing changes that are marked in red on
the accompanying "Annotated Sheet Showing Changes" of Fig. 1.
A formal "Replacement Sheet" of amended Fig. 1 is also
enclosed.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Applic. No. 10/799,099
Amdt. dated March 30, 2007
Reply to Office action of February 27, 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-75 remain in the application.

In the first paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, the Examiner stated that Figure 1 should be designated as "Prior Art". As noted above in the drawing amendments section, Fig. 1 has been labeled as suggested by the Examiner as "Prior Art".

In item second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 68-75 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

The Examiner alleges that "these claims recite steps of a method, but they depend from claims that recite apparatus, therefore it is unclear what statutory class of invention applicant is claiming in claims 68-75.

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner is in error. More specifically, MPEP 2173.05(f) provides that making a method

Applic. No. 10/799,099
Amdt. dated March 30, 2007
Reply to Office action of February 27, 2007

claim dependent on a product claim is perfectly acceptable.

Furthermore, there are many issued U.S. Patents that include method claims, which depend from product claims (U.S. Patent Nos. 6,637,440; 6,990,716; 6,462,340; and 6,614,028).

Accordingly, claims 68-75 are of proper dependent form.

Therefore, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner's allegation pertaining to the dependency of claims 68-75, is not accurate and claims 68-75 are of proper dependent form.

Accordingly claims 68-75 have not been amended to overcome the objection by the Examiner.

It is appreciatively noted from page 2 of the Office action that claims 1-67 are allowed.

Since only allowable claims remain, the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited herewith.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/799,099
Amdt. dated March 30, 2007
Reply to Office action of February 27, 2007

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

March 30, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101



1/3

FIG. 1
PRIOR ART

